

4-5313

1 September 1953

MEMORANDUM FOR: Acting Deputy Director (Administration)

SUBJECT : Communications

1. In line with our several conversations I am addressing you to detail some of my unfortunate communications experiences, with the suggestion that these experiences (which may be typical of others elsewhere in the Agency) warrant a study of the systems employed. It is manifest that such delays as those detailed below are frustrating and time consuming, and while it may be difficult or impossible to cost-account frustration, loss of time, innumerable telephone calls, etc., there is no doubt that the dollar and cent cost is extremely high, not to mention resulting relative failure in the performance of our major mission. I would recommend that you direct a system study of the entire problem.

2. On a case basis I cite four examples of serious delays:

25X1A

a. On 26 June I prepared an official dispatch to [redacted] then in [redacted] and on the same day I wrote him a purely personal letter in which I referred to my separate letter. His personal lines of 8 July acknowledged my personal letter only; the official letter had not then been received, nor on 18 July when he wrote to me again. On 14 July I learned that this official letter was about to be dispatched from HQ, and it did finally reach him on 21 July. Since this was my first dispatch to him, in this form, I had already checked the format with RI, and the fact that it finally went out precisely as written originally would indicate that technical form was not the cause of the delay.

25X1A

25X1A

b. Also on 26 June I wrote a dispatch to the auditor attached to [redacted] and again on 14 July I learned that this had been held up. It was still in HQ on 5 August, when I was belatedly advised that it was technically deficient in that the name [redacted] was preceded by the title "Mr.". Obviously out of date, some six weeks later, this dispatch was re-written on 10 August, and sent out as [redacted] on 13 August.

25X1A

25X1A

c. Another dispatch addressed to [redacted] on 14 July, was not dispatched from HQ until 23 July. It reached [redacted] on 28 July, after his departure, and was returned here (why?). It reached HQ prior to 11 August and, worst of all, came to my attention only on 28 August—at least 17 days after reaching here. It is now out of date, but has nevertheless been re-forwarded [redacted]

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

d. [redacted] personal letter to me of 22 July advised me that his official report of the same date was "in the mail today" and that a copy had been marked for me. His personal letter was received at home on 25 July and on Monday, 27th, I started looking for my copy of his official dispatch, the original of which was addressed to the DCI.

25X1A

Evidently it was received here at the end of July (on 30 July HQ Registry expressed concern over technical deficiencies and requested me on the same day to write to [redacted] which left HQ on 10 August) and

25X1A

25X1A

I finally got my copy on 3 August—a relatively short delay. On 11 August the Comptroller and Auditor-in-Chief concurred in a cable to General [redacted]

25X1A

25X1A

in response to paragraph four of this report. However, several subjects raised by [redacted] require action at higher levels, and to assure myself that such action was in progress I checked with the Inspector General on 11 August. Until that date the existence of the report had not been brought to his attention, nor to that of the DDCI (in the absence of the DCI).

e. Cables—In the nature of any large organization clearances are necessary, but they often have the effect of holding up cables which for their value depend upon prompt dispatch. If it is possible to cut down this time lapse the work of the Agency will benefit.

25X1A

[redacted]
For the Auditor-in-Chief

STB:map